The Hawaiian Star,
DAILY AND SEMI-WEEKLY.

Published every afternoon (except Sunday) by the Hawaiian Star Newspaper Association, Limited.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Local, per annum .....$ 8.00
Foreign, " 12.00
Payable in advance.

FRANK L. HOOGS.....MANAGER

TUESDAY.....NOVEMBER 14, 1905

Charles Denby's New Service

Charles Denby, who passed through Honolulu only a short time ago has been appointed chief clerk of the State Department to succeed Col. Michael. He is a son of the late Charles Denby, formerly minister to China and later a member with President Schurman of Cornell of the first Philippine commission. Mr. Denby is a graduate of Princeton and went to China as secretary of the legation in 1885. He served thirteen years in this capacity. He acted as charge of the legation during the Chino-Japanese war, and earned high praise from the State Department for his management of the post.

During the boxer war he was made secretary of the international government established at Tientsin, and remained there two years, till this provisional government was dissolved and the management of affairs handed back to China.

Since that time Mr Denby has been the diplomatic adviser of Yuan Shi Kai, governor of Pechili province. It is a much more important and lucrative post that he gives up to come to Washington, but he has been away from America so long that both he and Mrs. Denby want to return and identify themselves once more with their own country.

The new chief clerk is not only thoroughly conversant with far-eastern affairs, but speaks and writes Chinese fluently. He is also a thorough French scholar.

During his service in China he was a close friend of Count Cassini, formerly Russian ambassador to Washington, and of Baron von Sternberg who was then secretary to the German legation in Peking. His brother Edwin Denby has just been elected representative in Congress from Detroit and will take his seat at the coming session of Congress.

The New Civil Service Order

Nothing in connection with civil service regulations has created so much discussion outside the classified service or so much trepidation and consternation inside it, as President Roosevelt's recent order giving heads of departments the right to summarily dismiss employes in the classified civil service without charges, hearing, or notice.

By those who defend the President's order it is claimed that the real strength of civil service reform lies in the fact that appointments can come only from the eligible lists, and not in the protection of the individual from summary removal. The argument is that there is no temptation to remove without cause when the appointing power does not have free choice as to selection of a successor.

On the other hand the argument is very strenuously made that the right to summarily remove makes it possible to bring about the appointment of favorites. It is claimed that if one summary removal does not bring about the opportunity, a second or a series of summary removals will.

According to accounts in the Washington Star, the order was mainly brought about by the foolish conduct of the chauffeur of a government automobile, which belonged to the bureau of standards. The story is that he drove his vehicle in front of the President's carriage so as to block its passage. He may have been under the influence of liquor or he may not have known whom he was annoying. But at any rate the President was naturally angered by his persistent interference. He thought it a good case for the exercise of prompt discipline and would undoubtedly have discharged the man forthwith but for the rule which made it necessary to report the matter to the civil service commission. The man will undoubtedly be dismissed, but the incident showed the chief executive what he considered a defect in the system. Naturally he did not want to appear on the offiical records as asking for the dismissal of a low-grade employe for personal reasons.

In some quarters it is claimed that the order is designed to expedite matters in getting rid of undesirable clerks, and confers no more authority on the cabinet officials than they had under the order which the new one replaces. It was pointed out that the change is simply this: Heretofore a cabinet official who found an inefficient clerk in his force was required to notify that clerk that he was considered undesirable, and to ask him for an explanation. The clerk was allowed three days in which to present this explanation. The head of the department who filed the charges or called on the clerk for the explanation was the sole judge as to whether or not the excuse was satisfactory. Civil service employes are quoted as saying that in twenty years' service in the department there never was known an explanation that was satisfactory. This procedure took time, and some times was a severe tax on the patience of the head of the department, because, as a rule the first step an inefficient clerk takes when he is informed that his head is in danger is to notify his senator or representative in Congress, and the office is overrun with influential personages who endeavor to have the clerk retained or the papers held up.

In a number of cases matters went so far that the President himself was asked to interfere and keep an employe in his position. The annoyance of having his office overrun with politicians who came to bolster up the chances of useless employes became more than the heads of the departments felt they were called upon to stand. They were frequently interrupted in important work to receive such visitors, and these visitors usually were of so much importance themselves that it was not possible to turn them off, as ordinary visitors would be done. The cabinet officials therefore felt that they should be relieved, and it is believed they appealed to the President, with the order of yesterday as a result.

It is claimed that under the new ruling the dismissal of undesirable clerks is simply expedited. Instead of asking the clerk for an explanation, which was invariably unsatisfactory, the head of the department simply dismisses him from the service and files his reasons with the order of dismissal.

The civil service commission was not asked to prepare the order, as is usually done. The President sent for one of the commissioners, it is stated, and announced his intention to issue the order. That was the first the commissioner had heard of it except in the way of gossip.

The order requires the heads of departments to file a statement in writing for the reason for all removals, but it does not require any notice to the person sought to be discharged. An exception to this is made where misenduct is committed in the view and presence of the President or head of an executive department; in such case no statement of reasons for the separation from the service need be filed.

Notwithstanding all this, it is clear from the discussion of the subject in the eastern press that there is a widespread fear that the result of the order will be a general clearing out of the older employes of the service, irrespective of their zeal and industry, and that a real protection to the civil service employe who is without political influence has ben taken away.

BISHOP MERRILL.

Bishop Stephen Merrill of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose death is announced by the cable, is one of the last of what may be called the second, or perhaps the third generation of Methodist bishops. His early ministry was begun in that period of intense preaching zeal which produced Peter Cartwright, Peter Akers, and scores of other intensely effective preachers in the Methodist church, and in other churches, and carried Methodism wherever the hardy pioneers of the west established themselves. It was the zenith days of the circuit rider.

The meridian days of his early prime were those of the civil war and the period of reconstruction which followed, when the Methodist church by reason of its large and its widespread membership, and its dominating religious influence in those sections of the country which at the time were so intensely influential in national affairs, had a large direct and indirect influence in moulding public opinion.

His Episcopacy began in the days following the period of reconstruction, and in the days when that remarkable shifting from rural to urban population began, or at least began to be in full tide, in the United States. When he became a Bishop the great strength of the Methodist chruch was in the rural districts, and its religious predominance in the whole Mississippi Valley was unquestioned. During his Episcopacy, the Methodist church was established in the cities as it had not been before, and strangely enough, it lost much of its primacy in the rural districts.

Bishop Merrill was a simple minded man to whom the Episcopacy brought many burdens and sorrows. Essentially a preacher, the great burdens of administration and of executive difficulties which his position threw on him, weighed heavily. He met them with that simple directness which was a part of his character, and acquitted creditably and to the advantage of the church, not because he brought great powers of administration to the work but because he brought a guileless mind, a sincere sense of responsibility, and the unconscious courage which does not know how to falter.

There have been many greater men than Bishop Merrill in the Methodist Episcopacy—greater in intellectual power, greater in homiletic ability, greater in visible effectiveness upon contemporary affairs. But there have been few more gentle and lovable, more devoted or self-sacrificing.

President McCall of the New York Life says he will pay back the $235,000 spent in Albany if the lobbyist, Hamilton, does not do so within a month. The probabilities are that Hamilton will, even if McCall has to furnish him the money with which to do it. This would naturally shut off any inquiries that might be made as to what Hamilton did with the money when it was given to him originally.

They seem to be able to cure leprosy everywhere except in Hawaii. The latest reported cure is in New Orleans. Still perhaps if it were not so far away, there might not be so much positiveness about its being a cure.

According to an esteemed contemporary the harbor is to be equipped with beacons "which will burn for five days without going out." That will be very nice indeed, but would it not be better if the beacons burned during the nights?

SHOTS AT SHAW.

Mr. George Bernard Shaw has been hooted by a London audience because of his attack on Irving. He may have said what he thought; but he is always inclined to attribute to his fellow men an undue anxiety to learn his opinions. Perhaps hereafter he will reserve his verbal ammunition for Shakespeare, who has no personal friends still living.—Providence Journal.

Competent critics pronounce G. Bernard Shaw's beard the worst of his productions.—Chicago Tribune.

Criticisms seems to make Bernard Shaw flourish, while the bottom falls out of an Ade play when the critics jump on it.—Sioux City Tribune.

It is just likt G. Bernard Shaw to say things about Irving when the great actor cannot answer.—Chicago Evening Post.

It is suspected that Jerome K. Jerome is making a tour of America largely to prove that British humor isn't so hard to understand as Bernard Shaw would pretend.—Toronto Star.

George Bernard Shaw's diatribe against Sir Henry Irving recalls the old story of the living jackass kicking the dead lion.—Portland Advertiser.

TRANS-PACIFIC CABLEGRAM.

Commercial Cable and Postal Telegraph Companies in the United States.

San Francisco Nov. 10, 1905, 10 a. m.

To Lewis & Co. Honolulu.

We win: We have received two more gold medals at the Lewis & Clarke Exposition Portland Oregon. This put us far in the lead of all California wines.

The Napa & Sonoma Wine Co.

Per Lewis & Co., Sole Agents. 169 King Street, Telephone 240.